## **REMARKS**

## 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 35-71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103 as being unpatentable over Boyne, U.S. Patent No. 4,941,125 (hereinafter "Boyne") in view of Glickman et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,358,824 (hereinafter "Glickman").

In regards to independent claim 35, the Examiner states that the

combined teachings of Boyne and Glickman render claim 35 obvious.

Specifically, the Examiner states that, "a method for storing, archiving and indexing documents for retrieval with a database between a processor and a peripheral device" is met by Boyne. The Applicants respectfully submit that claim 35 teaches a method of transferring document data as part of executing an application program. Boyne does not disclose such a method as part of executing an application program. Emphasis added. Boyne discloses an "archival document image storage and retrieval system for storing image information representing the content of a plurality of archival documents..." Boyne, col. 8, lines 7-10. Boyne further discloses the use of a modem coupled to a processor for bi-directional communications that would allow for remote access of data. Boyne, col. 7, lines

Appl. No. 09/759,002 Amdt. dated July 2, 2004 Reply to Office action of April 2, 2004

32-43. This does not teach or suggest transferring document data as part of

executing an application program as claimed in claim 35.

Further, the Examiner cites to Glickman as teaching "a program for abstracting and archiving documents employing an identifier code and word index file storage." Glickman, col. 4, lines 15-31. The Applicants submit that Glickman only discloses the use of indexing in regards to associating an index with each record in a database, such that the index value remains the same no matter how and when a record's value is changed. Specifically, Glickman states that "[a] record usually retains the same identifier code throughout its existence and modifications to the record replace the record in storage under the same identifier code. "Glickman, col. 4, lines 20-23. Glickman fails to teach the archiving of document data with the index information in conjunction with transferring the document between the processing device and the peripheral device transparently to the application program. The above language as claimed in claim 35 is markedly different than the mere association of an index with a data record as disclosed by Glickman. Hence, Glickman clearly fails to teach the archiving of data in conjunction with transferring the data to an application program.

The Applicants respectfully submit that all the limitations of claim 35 are not taught by the combination of Boyne and Glickman, and thus the present invention as claimed in claim 35, and all its dependent claims, are not made obvious by the combination.

Independent claims 52, 61, 68 and 70 all contain the same elements as independent claim 35. The Examiner also uses the same references and specific cites to reject these claims. The Applicants believe that the same argument as

Appl. No. 09/759,002

used above would be valid in regards to the other independent claims and hence a separate discussion would be unnecessary. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 52, 61, 68 and 70 and all their dependent claims are not made obvious by the combination of Boyne and Glickman.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims of independent claims 35, 52, 61, 68 and 70 are also not taught by the combination of Boyne and Glickman for the same reasons as stated above and hence are also in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 09/759,002 Amdt. dated July 2, 2004 Reply to Office action of April 2, 2004

## CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) have been overcome by the above remarks and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that claims 35-71 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Thomas Webster at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 12 レ , 2004

Michael J. Mallie Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor Los Angeles, CA. 90025-1026 (408) 720-859 (408) 720-8300